

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/620,138	07/14/2003	Mark A. Poland	494	8464
28782 7	590 04/16/2004		EXAM	INER
WILLIAM E	HEIN		PRICE, RICHARD THOMAS JR	
PO BOX 335 LOVELAND, CO 80539-0335			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3643	

DATE MAILED: 04/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

ب المحالية					
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Commons	10/620,138	MARK A. POLAND			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
41	Thomas Price	3643			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR ITHE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communica - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) day - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, b Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	TION. CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reption. s, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTly statute, cause the application to become ABA	oly be timely filed (30) days will be considered timely. HS from the mailing date of this communication. NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed or	16 March 2004.				
	This action is non-final.				
·=					
,	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-8 is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 9-15 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.					
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Ex	aminer.				
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)		y the Examiner.			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).					
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for f a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority doc 2. Certified copies of the priority doc 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International I * See the attached detailed Office action for	uments have been received. uments have been received in Ap e priority documents have been r Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	plication No eceived in this National Stage			
Attachment(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)					
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-9	Paper No(s)	/Mail Date			
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 6) Other:					

Application/Control Number: 10/620,138

Art Unit: 3643

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 9-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kadletz et al '439 in view of Williams '931.

Kadletz teaches a fish skinning and scaling device which is structurally similar to the Applicant's claimed shelling tool. More specifically, the shelling tool having a handle B4 and an elongate rod (A6 and D) extending away from the handle, a longitudinal slit is formed between a' and d' that extends inwardly from a distal end thereof. The slit defines an upper rod fork and a lower rod fork of said elongate rod. The slit of Kadletz et al forms a knife for slitting the skin of a fish. However, Kadletz et al do not discuss using the device for shelling a crustacean to permit removal of meat from a tail shell thereof. Williams teaches a hand operated crab leg opener with multiangled blade and a method thereof. Specifically, Williams teaches removing or separating a head/body portion of a crustacean from the tail shell, and sliding a upper and lower rod fork into an open end of said tail shell along an inside surface of an underside of said tail shell. The tool can further be rotated about a longitudinal axis thereof to produce a crack in said underside of said tail shell. Regarding claim 9, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the device of Kadletz

Application/Control Number: 10/620,138

Art Unit: 3643

et al in such a way, in view of the teachings of Williams, in order to obtain meat from a crustacean. As for claim 10, the combination of Kadletz as modified by Williams, teaches rotating the device to produce a crack in the shell of the crustacean, although does not mention the specific angle. The Examiner believes that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would rotate the hand tool thru a variety of angles including 90 degrees, depending on the stiffness or rigidity of the shell and the desired crack to obtain the meat in the shell. In regards to claim 12, the tool includes a tether b and a finger ring A5. Regarding claims 14 and 15, the combination of Kadletz et al as modified by Williams teaches using the device on a lobster or crawfish, additionally, both are considered to be structurally equivalent.

Conclusion

Summary: Claims 1-8 are directed to a non-elected invention, while claims 9-15 have been rejected.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas Price whose telephone number is 703-308-2694. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30a.m. to 5:00p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter Poon can be reached on 703-308-2574. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3643

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Thomas Price

Primary Examiner GAU: 3643

rtp